

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 WENDY MAGUIRE,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 ECO SCIENCE SOLUTIONS, INC., *et al.*,

12 Defendants.

NO. C18-1301RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

13 On August 22, 2019, the Court found that defendants ESSI and/or its wholly-owned
14 subsidiary Ga-Du breached plaintiff's Employment Agreement and are liable for compensatory
15 damages thereunder. The Court also found that plaintiff's wages were unlawfully withheld after
16 she withdrew her consent to nonpayment and that "the employer and any officer, vice principal,
17 or agent involved in the decision not to pay" are liable for double damages and attorney's fees
18 under RCW 49.52.070. Dkt. # 32.¹ Although plaintiff specifically sought a declaration that
19 defendants Rountree and Lewis were personally liable for the statutory wage violations,
20 defendants did not address this claim for relief in their cross-motion. Nevertheless, the evidence
21 plaintiff provided did not establish the liability of the individual defendants as a matter of law,
22 and the Court simply noted that any officers, vice principals, or agents ultimately found to have
23
24
25

26 ¹ Defendants' cross-motion for summary judgment regarding plaintiff's breach of contract and
27 statutory wage claims was denied. Id.

1 been involved in the decision not to pay would be liable under RCW 49.52.050 and RCW
2 49.52.070.

3 Defendants have now filed a motion for reconsideration seeking “a confirmation that the
4 judgment resulting from the [summary judgment order] will be entered against ESSI alone, and
5 not against the individual defendants Rountree or Lewis.” Dkt. # 34. Motions for reconsideration
6 are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a “showing of manifest error in the
7 prior ruling” or “new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s]
8 attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1). Defendants request for “clarification”
9 essentially seeks summary judgment in their favor on an issue they chose to ignore based on
10 evidence regarding the internal workings of ESSI and Ga-Du that could have and should have
11 been brought to the Court’s attention earlier. Because defendants have not met their burden
12 under LCR 7(h)(1), the motion for reconsideration is DENIED.
13
14
15
16

17 Dated this 20th day of November, 2019.

18 

19 Robert S. Lasnik
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27